

247.573

under chapter 121 of title 46 U.S.C., unless the contract contains the clause at 252.247-7027.

[65 FR 50146, Aug. 17, 2000, as amended at 70 FR 35545, June 21, 2005. Redesignated and amended at 72 FR 49206, Aug. 28, 2007; 73 FR 70911, Nov. 24, 2008; 75 FR 65438, Oct. 25, 2010]

247.573 Procedures.

[72 FR 49206, Aug. 28, 2007]

247.573-1 Ocean transportation incidental to a contract for supplies, services, or construction.

(a) This subsection applies when ocean transportation is not the principal purpose of the contract, and the cargo to be transported is owned by DoD or is clearly identifiable for eventual use by DoD.

(b) DD Form 1653, Transportation Data for Solicitations, shall be used—

(1) By the requesting activity in developing the Government estimate for transportation costs; and

(2) By the contracting officer in ensuring that valid shipping instructions and delivery terms are included in solicitations and contracts that may involve transportation of supplies by sea.

(c) If the contractor notifies the contracting officer that the contractor or a subcontractor considers that—

(1) No U.S.-flag vessels are available, the contracting officer must request confirmation of the nonavailability from—

(i) The Commander, Military Sealift Command (MSC), through the Contracts and Business Management Directorate, MSC; or

(ii) The Commander, Military Surface Deployment and Distribution (SDDC), through the SDDC global e-mailbox *sddc.ops.ffw@us.army.mil* and the Principal Assistant Responsible for Contracting, SDDC.

(2) The proposed freight charges to the Government, the contractor, or any subcontractor are higher than charges for transportation of like goods to private persons, the contracting officer may approve a request for an exception to the requirement to ship on U.S.-flag vessels for a particular shipment.

(i) Prior to granting an exception, the contracting officer must request advice, oral or written, from the Com-

48 CFR Ch. 2 (10-1-11 Edition)

mander, MSC, or the Commander, MTMC.

(ii) In advising the contracting officer whether to grant the exception, the Commander, MSC, or the Commander, SDDC, must consider, as appropriate, evidence from—

(A) Published tariffs;

(B) Industry publications;

(C) The Maritime Administration; and

(D) Any other available sources.

(3) The freight charges proposed by U.S.-flag carriers are excessive or otherwise unreasonable—

(i) The contracting officer must prepare a report in determination and finding format, and must—

(A) Take into consideration that the 1904 Act is, in part, a subsidy of the U.S.-flag commercial shipping industry that recognizes that lower prices may be available from foreign-flag carriers. Therefore, a lower price for use of a foreign-flag vessel is not a sufficient basis, on its own, to determine that the freight rate proposed by the U.S.-flag carrier is excessive or otherwise unreasonable. However, such a price differential may indicate a need for further review;

(B) Consider, accordingly, not only excessive profits to the carrier (to include vessel owner or operator), if ascertainable, but also excessive costs to the Government (i.e., costs beyond the economic penalty normally incurred by excluding foreign competition) resulting from the use of U.S.-flag vessels in extraordinarily inefficient circumstances; and

(C) Include an analysis of whether the cost is excessive, taking into account factors such as—

(1) The differential between the freight charges proposed by the U.S.-flag carrier and an estimate of what foreign-flag carriers would charge based upon a price analysis;

(2) A comparison of U.S.-flag rates charged on comparable routes;

(3) Efficiency of operation regardless of rate differential (*e.g.*, suitability of the vessel for the required transportation in terms of cargo requirements or vessel capacity, and the commercial reasonableness of vessel positioning required); and